SN. 09/826,557   ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CANO:023

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 12-14, and 16-22 are now pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 2, 6, 11, and 15 have been canceled, and independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 20 have been amended to incorporate the subject of the canceled claims and to further clarify the invention. Support for the amendment can be found at least on page 11-12 and 19-24. Dependent claims 7-9 and 16-18 have been amended to depend from claim 1 or 10. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson (USP 6,248,996) in view of Fujino (USP 6,476,935). Applicant traverses this rejection because the combination would not have taught the displaying and processing features, as set forth in independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 20, as presently amended.

Independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 20 each call for transmitting the same data to a plurality of destination using respective different transmission protocols, and using the same predetermined identifier associated with all of the transmissions of the same data. When the same data is sent by the respective different transmission protocols, the different transmissions of the same data can be collectively managed, such as collectively interrupting the transmissions (see Fig. 8) using the same predetermined identifier.

These claims, as presently amended, each further call for 1) displaying that the same identifier is assigned to each of the plurality of transmissions to the plurality of destinations designated for the same data, and displaying a list based on information relating to the plurality of transmissions, 2) performing a processing corresponding to an instruction for the plurality of transmissions associated with the identifier in response to receiving the instruction together with the identifier, and 3) performing a processing corresponding to an instruction for a specific one of the plurality of transmissions in response to receiving the instruction together with the specific one of the plurality of transmissions.

Johnson discloses simultaneously transmitting the same image data to a plurality of receiver destinations using a scanner 10 (see Figs. 2 and 3) and displaying the transmission status on a touchscreen display 58. Johnson discloses that some scanners enable a user to electronically send a scanned document to a specific receiver destination, such as using

7

SN. 09/826,557   ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CANO:023

Hewlett-Packard's JETSEND technology. A job number or ID is assigned to each destination address selected. Connections are then made between the scanning device and the destination addresses to determine the type and availability of each receiver destination. At that time, the data type (e.g., dpi and bpp) of each receiver destination is also negotiated. See column 4, lines 8-14. After the entire document has been scanned, electronic data files 50, 52, 54 (in different formats) corresponding to buffers 42, 44, and 46 are created. The data from respective files 50, 52, and 54 are then simultaneously sent to receiver destinations. The touchscreen display 58 can display the transmission status, which can be updated in real time by using a standard query loop with existing JETSEND technology. See column 4, lines 35-46. Johnson also discloses creating a single electronic data file 70 after the entire document has been scanned and then simultaneously sending to receiver destinations 62, 64, and 66. The transmission status also can be displayed and updated in real time by using a standard query loop with existing JETSEND technology. See column 5, lines 1-6.

In Johnson, each job number can be queried at regular intervals to obtain updated status information while transmitting files as electronic data to selected receiver destinations. Updated transmission status of an electronic file can be displayed while transmitting the electronic file to the selected receiver destinations. See column 2, lines 60-67.

Johnson, however, transmits the same image data via the same transmission protocol and does not disclose or teach using a same predetermined identifier associated with all of the transmissions of the same data, as acknowledged by the examiner. Further, since a different job ID is assigned to each destination address selected, it is not possible to recognize the plurality transmissions to the plurality of destinations designated for the same data as a single group. As Johnson lacks the above-identified claimed features, the examiner applied Fujino for the proposition that using a same predetermined identifier associated with all of the transmissions of the same data would have been obvious.

Specifically, Fujino discloses a data communication apparatus having a central processing unit (CPU) 1, which controls the overall apparatus in accordance with the contents of a program stored in a ROM (column 3, lines 9 to 13). The CPU refers to a logic table (FIG. 3), which includes a destination data management table 301, a start address 302 of transmission data stored in an image memory (DRAM) 5, and a busy indication switch 303 including flags each indicating whether or not a corresponding line is busy. The destination data management table 301 manages destination names to which transmission is to be made, facsimile numbers, and the like in units of destinations, and has flag fields each indicating whether or not transmission has been accomplished, in units of destinations. See column 5, lines 7-21.

8

Fujino discloses automatically aborting communications via a plurality of lines when a user instructs to abort communications during multicast transmission. See FIG. 13. If the flow advances from the state shown in FIG. 15 (steps S50, S43, S44, and S45), since the user has instructed to abort the communication for destination A, the communication management task hunts for line connection control tasks with busy flags=1 in image file management information 1 shown in FIG. 10. See column 9, lines 26-32.

Upon completion of transmission to all the destinations, or upon generation of a deletion request of an image file, i.e., a transmission abort request by an operator, the image file is deleted after it is confirmed by checking the image file management information that communications via all the lines have been completed. Hence, an identical image file can be asynchronously and parallelly transmitted using a plurality of lines without deleting the image file during transmission of an image. See column 10, lines 41-62.

Fujino indeed discloses displaying the line states during communications, as shown in FIG. 15, which illustrates the states of image file management information 1 and image file management information 2 during transmission of image file 2 (FIG.10), namely, the states in which the image file management information 1 is transmitted to destinations A, B, and the image file management information 2 is transmitted to destinations C, D. Fujino, however, only discloses displaying each of four transmissions individually (see FIG. 15), and does not disclose displaying the transmissions to destinations A, B for the same data to enable user to recognize the transmissions as a single group. Further, while Fujino discloses the ability to abort a plurality of transmissions individually, it is not possible to collectively request abort for a plurality of transmissions associated with the same identifier. Accordingly, the combination would not have taught at least 1) displaying that the same identifier is assigned to each of the plurality of transmissions to the plurality of destinations designated for the same data, and displaying a list based on information relating to the plurality of transmissions, 2) performing a processing corresponding to an instruction for the plurality of transmissions associated with the identifier in response to receiving the instruction together with the identifier, and 3) performing a processing corresponding to an instruction for a specific one of the plurality of transmissions in response to receiving the instruction together with the specific one of the plurality of transmissions, as presently set forth in the independent claims, even if Fujino were to teach, for argument's sake, assigning a same identifier to all of the transmissions of the same data.

9

SN. 09/826,557   ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CANO:023

<u>Conclusion</u>

Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 12-14, and 16-22 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

05/09/06
DATE

MARC A. ROSSI
REG. NO. 31,923

P.O. BOX 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)

10